

ORIGINAL

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
DALLAS DIVISION

FILED-USDC-NDTX-DA  
'25 FEB 24 PM1:31  
LNS

AMAZON CONTENT SERVICES LLC;	§	
COLUMBIA PICTURES INDUSTRIES,	§	
INC.; DISNEY ENTERPRISES, INC.;	§	
NETFLIX US, LLC; NETFLIX	§	
WORLDWIDE ENTERTAINMENT, LLC;	§	
PARAMOUNT PICTURES	§	CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:24-cv-733
CORPORATION; SONY PICTURES	§	
ANIMATION INC.; UNIVERSAL CITY	§	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
STUDIOS PRODUCTIONS LLLP;	§	
WARNER BROS. ENTERTAINMENT	§	
INC.,	§	
Plaintiffs,	§	
vs.	§	
WILLIAM FREEMON; FREEMON	§	
TECHNOLOGY INDUSTRIES LLC;	§	
Defendants.	§	

**DEFENDANT'S REQUEST FOR RULING ON PENDING MOTIONS**

**TO THE HONORABLE COURT:**

Defendant, **William Freeman**, respectfully submits this **Request for a Ruling on Pending Motions**, citing the significant delay in the resolution of critical motions that directly impact the progression of this case. The motions currently pending before the Court include:

1. **Defendant's Motion to Dismiss**, filed **November 22, 2024**;
2. **Plaintiffs' Motion for Default Judgment**, filed **December 5, 2024**; and
3. **Defendant's Motion to Strike**, filed **February 10, 2025**.

**I. A Ruling on the Motion to Dismiss is Necessary Before Default Judgment Can Be Considered**

The Motion to Dismiss, filed on November 22, 2024, has been pending for over three months with no ruling. Plaintiffs' Motion for Default Judgment, filed December 5, 2024, is premature and should not be considered while a dispositive motion that challenges the viability of Plaintiffs' claims remains unresolved. The Court's ruling on the Motion to Dismiss is essential to determine whether Plaintiffs' claims can proceed at all. A failure to resolve this threshold issue before ruling on default judgment would create **procedural and substantive prejudice** against Defendant.

## **II. The Motion to Strike Must Be Decided Before Default Judgment Can Be Considered Against Freemon Technology Industries LLC**

Plaintiffs have requested default judgment, in part, based on the claim that **Freemon Technology Industries LLC failed to respond to the complaint**. However, Defendant's Motion to Strike, filed February 10, 2025, challenges the inclusion of **Freemon Technology Industries LLC in this lawsuit**. A ruling on this motion **must precede** any consideration of default judgment against the business entity. If the Court grants the Motion to Strike, Plaintiffs' basis for default judgment would no longer be valid. Allowing a default judgment ruling to proceed without first addressing the legitimacy of the business's inclusion would be **procedurally improper and highly prejudicial**.

## **III. Plaintiffs' Delay Tactics and Procedural Gamesmanship**

Plaintiffs have engaged in **deliberate procedural tactics** that continue to **stall the resolution of this case** while leaving their Motion for Default Judgment pending. These tactics include:

1. **Deliberate delays in filing their own Joint Rule 26(f) Report** while simultaneously demanding that Defendant withdraw his, further slowing litigation progress.
2. **Refusal to engage in structured settlement discussions**, including rejecting multiple settlement offers without providing counteroffers or clarifying their positions using the structured settlement chart.
3. **Frivolous and speculative claims**, such as their assertion that payments to an account named "\$ftindustries" are evidence of payments to **Freemon Technology Industries LLC**. Plaintiffs have provided no supporting evidence for this claim, despite numerous **legitimate businesses operating under the name "FT Industries" across multiple states**. Their reliance on such speculative reasoning demonstrates their broader strategy of advancing weak claims to prolong litigation rather than engaging in meaningful resolution.

## **IV. Defendant Will Suffer Prejudice If a Ruling on Pending Motions is Further Delayed**

The continued delay in ruling on these motions is prejudicial to Defendant and hinders his ability to properly defend himself. Plaintiffs have taken advantage of this delay to push forward their default judgment request while avoiding accountability for their own delays in discovery and trial preparation. Further delay will:

1. Prevent Defendant from obtaining clarity on the status of the claims against him and his business;
2. Allow Plaintiffs to continue leveraging procedural tactics to prolong the litigation; and
3. Unfairly disadvantage Defendant in preparing for trial and future proceedings.

## V. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Defendant respectfully requests that the Court:

1. **Issue a ruling on Defendant's Motion to Dismiss (filed November 22, 2024) before considering Plaintiffs' Motion for Default Judgment.**
2. **Issue a ruling on Defendant's Motion to Strike (filed February 10, 2025) before considering any request for default judgment against Freemon Technology Industries LLC.**
3. **Clarify the status of these pending motions to ensure that litigation progresses fairly and efficiently.**

Defendant further requests that the Court **reject any further procedural attempts by Plaintiffs to delay resolution of these motions**, as such delays are being used to Plaintiffs' strategic advantage rather than serving a legitimate purpose in advancing this litigation.

Dated: February 24, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

*/s/ William Freemon*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
William Freemon , Pro Se  
1528 Meadow Valley Lane  
Dallas, Texas 75232  
[wiliamfreemon@gmail.com](mailto:wiliamfreemon@gmail.com)  
817 300-9702 – Telephone